

REMARKS

Claims 11-18 and 29-32 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-10 and 19-28 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 11-18 and 29-32 are rejected.

Claims 11 and 29 have been amended. Reconsideration of claims 11-18 and 29-32 is requested.

New claims 33-43 have been added for consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11-18 and 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shuman (US Patent No. 6,616,071) in view of Stuempfle (U.S. Patent No. 6,505,100).

The rejections are respectfully traversed, however claim 11 has been amended to further clarify the subject matter of the invention in order to facilitate bringing this case into allowance.

Claim 11 discloses a dynamic configuration system operating independently on multiple different ones of the on-board multiple processors that each automatically incorporates new hardware devices into the multiprocessing system for direct communication with one or more of the multiple on-board processors.

The configuration system further automatically reconfigures the multiprocessor system in real-time to run at least some of the automobile applications normally run on primary on-board processors on different auxiliary on-board processors in the multiprocessing system by replacing the execution of the automobile

applications normally run by the auxiliary on-board processors with the execution of the automobile applications normally run by the primary on-board processors.

This is all clearly shown in FIG. 1 where multiple different processors 14, 20, 16 and 18 each independently run a dynamic configuration system 10. Further, as described in FIGS. 8 and 9, different on-board processors can be automatically reconfigured in real-time so that applications normally run on primary on-board processors are automatically reconfigured to run on different auxiliary on-board processors in the multiprocessing system where the automobile applications normally run by the auxiliary on-board processors are replaced with the execution of the automobile applications normally run by the primary on-board processors.

The Examiner already acknowledges that Shuman does not disclose a configuration manager that automatically reconfigures the multiprocessor system. Shuman actually teaches away from running applications on different processors by reason of the firewalls that provide "limited interactions between the driver assistance systems and the other in-vehicle systems" to provide for "selective isolation of the drive assistance systems" (col. 31, line 65 to col. 32, line 3).

Similarly, Stuempfle does not disclose independently operating dynamic configuration systems operated on multiple different on-board processors as specified in claim 11. Conversely, Stuempfle teaches transferring software processing operations between devices located in the vehicle (Fig. 1, item 1) and computers 2 and 3 located outside of the vehicle (Fig. 2). The processing in Stuempfle is only moved into and out of the vehicle (col. 10, lines 7-20) and does not suggest reconfiguring the applications on different on-board processors as specified in claim 11.

Regardless, claim 11 further specifies a configuration system that automatically reconfigures the multiprocessor system in real-time to run at least some

of the automobile applications normally run on primary on-board processors on different auxiliary on-board processors in the multiprocessing system by replacing the execution of the automobile applications normally run by the auxiliary on-board processors with the execution of the automobile applications normally run by the primary on-board processors. Again, this is clearly shown in FIGS. 8 and 9 and is not suggested in Shuman or Stuempfle.

The rejection of claim 12 based on Shuman reference at col. 24-25 is also respectfully traversed. Shuman does not disclose detecting signals generated by a new device, but rather the device manager described by Shuman receives requests from existing devices in order to form a vehicle-use priority list. The vehicle-use priority list processes requests from the devices for determining a relative priority of operation of the devices. This is unrelated to detection of a new device.

Similarly the rejections of claims 13-17 based on Shuman at col. 1 of the background section and at cols. 25-26 are also respectfully traversed. Shuman merely recognizes a need to provide a back-up feature as background information, but does not disclose running a failed application on a different on-board processor that normally runs other automobile applications, for example, to provide the back-up feature. Similarly, the mayday feature disclosed at cols. 25-26 of Shuman does not teach a system wherein a failed application or stored critical data is run on a different on-board processor. The mayday feature does not display applications on other processors that can be replaced with the copies of the failed application. Instead, the mayday feature in Shuman receives system data and upon detection of a triggering event compiles an emergency request.

Amended claim 29 and new claim 33 are allowable for the same or similar reasons as claim 11. Additionally, claim 29 includes a data manager that identifies


data generated by the new devices and identifies other devices in the multiprocessor system that can input or output the identified data. This further limitation is likewise not disclosed or taught by either Shuman or Stuempfle.

Any statements made by Examiner that are not addressed by Applicant do not necessarily constitute agreement by the Applicant. In some cases Applicant may have amended independent claims thereby obviating grounds for rejection of dependent claims, for example.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 11-18 and 29-32, as well as consideration of new claims 33-43, is requested of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen S. Ford
Reg. No. 35,139

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613

Customer No. 20575